

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

CLARE U. ANAGONYE,

Plaintiff,

vs.

Case No. 21-11174

HON. GEORGE CARAM STEEH

TRANSFORM AUTOMOTIVE, LLC,

Defendant.

_____ /

ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND
RECOMMENDATION (ECF No. 75) AND GRANTING
DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT (EFC No. 59)

This matter is before the court on the Report and Recommendation (R&R) (ECF No. 75) prepared by the magistrate judge recommending that defendant Transform Automotive's (Transform) motion for summary judgment (ECF No. 59) be granted. Plaintiff, Clare Anagonye, appearing *pro se*, alleges that she suffered discrimination and/or retaliation after complaining to her employer, Transform, that she had been subjected to bullying and sexual harassment. Anagonye contends that rather than investigating her complaints, Transform only investigated complaints about Anagonye's sexual harassment of others in the workplace. Anagonye alleges that Transform discriminated against her in terminating her

employment based on her sex, and in retaliation for having made her initial complaint.

After discovery was completed, Transform filed a motion for summary judgment. Anagonye then filed a motion to extend discovery so she could take depositions of three Transform employees. The magistrate judge found good cause for the request and granted a limited extension of the discovery deadline so that Anagonye could take time-limited depositions of the three employees. After briefing on the dispositive motion was completed, the magistrate judge found that Anagonye failed to make a prima facie case of either sexual discrimination or retaliation for engaging in a protected activity in violation of Title VII. The magistrate judge also found that Anagonye failed to rebut Transform's articulated legitimate, non-discriminatory and non-retaliatory reason for terminating her employment. Finally, the magistrate judge found that Anagonye failed to raise a genuine issue of material fact that Transform's proffered reason was pretext. Based on his analysis, the magistrate judge recommended that Transform's motion for summary judgment be granted.

Objections, if any, are to be filed within 14 days of service of the R&R. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2). The R&R was mailed to Anagonye on December 27, 2023, at the address she provided to the

Court. See E.D. Mich. LR 11.2; ECF No. 5. Anagonye sent a letter, dated January 1, 2024, stating that she has not received “any letters or orders since July 2023 from the court, magistrate or defendant.” ECF No. 77. The case docket shows that the only items filed in the case since July 2023 are a sur-reply brief from plaintiff herself and the R&R, that was sent just days before plaintiff wrote her letter. The R&R has not been returned to the court as undeliverable. The court is satisfied that the R&R was properly served on Anagonye and that she did not file any timely objections.

This court agrees with and adopts the thorough analysis conducted and recommendation made by the magistrate judge. Now, therefore, for the reasons stated by the magistrate judge, the recommendation is adopted as an order of the court.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 76) is adopted by the Court.

IT IS HEREBY FURTHER ORDERED that defendant’s motion for summary judgment (ECF No. 59) is GRANTED.

Dated: January 24, 2024

s/George Caram Steeh
GEORGE CARAM STEEH
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Copies of this Order were served upon attorneys of record on January 24, 2024, by electronic and/or ordinary mail and also on Clare U. Anagonye, 1506 Nob Lane, Apt. 302, Pontiac, MI 48340.

s/LaShawn Saulsberry
Deputy Clerk